UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

The Social Man - - - *Kenneth L. Patton*

Spiritual Values in World Organization
- - - - - *Dorothy Bushnell Cole*

"The Mark of the Beast" - *Edward H. Redman*

Present Problems and Ancient Wisdom
- - - - - - *Victor S. Yarros*

Liberal Faith and Wartime Duty
- - - - - - *Clyde D. Williams*

VOLUME CXXVIII NUMBER 5

Chicago, July, 1942

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Monthly *Subscription $1.50*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, April 11, 1941, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Contributors

Kenneth L. Patton: Minister of the First Unitarian Society of Madison, Wisconsin.

Dorothy Bushnell Cole: Frequent contributor to UNITY.

Edward H. Redman: Minister of the Free Christian Church of Virginia, Minnesota.

Victor S. Yarros: Frequent contributor to UNITY.

Clyde D. Williams: Minister of the newly established Unitarian Church, Columbus, Ohio.

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Editorial—CURTIS W. REESE 67

Editorial Comments—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 68

Jottings—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 70

ARTICLES—

The Social Man—KENNETH L. PATTON 71

Spiritual Values in World Organization—DOROTHY BUSHNELL COLE 74

"The Mark of the Beast"—EDWARD H. REDMAN 76

Present Problems and Ancient Wisdom—VICTOR S. YARROS 78

Liberal Faith and Wartime Duty—CLYDE D. WILLIAMS 79

POETRY—

A World of Free Men—OSWELL G. TREADWAY 79

"Quite a Nice Parade"—HELEN FIELD WATSON 80

CORRESPONDENCE—

A Reply to Mr. Yarros—CHARLES P. SCHWARTZ 80

A Reader Comments on the June Issue—E. H. BARRETT 80

THE FIELD—

Current Status of Civil Liberties 66

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Current Status of Civil Liberties

Surveying the issues decided by the U. S. Supreme Court, the American Civil Liberties Union found that the "record for the year on the whole constituted a setback to civil liberties."

Examining the record of Congress, the report found that "no legislation hostile to civil liberties passed, though much was threatened, chiefly directed against labor and aliens. Nor was any legislation extending civil liberties adopted." The report criticized the activities of the Dies Committee as being "adverse to civil liberties, since the Committee's hostility to liberalism tends to encourage repressive measures and has already resulted directly or indirectly in the discharge of many federal employees with alleged 'subversive' — meaning Communist — connections.

"As in the previous years," the report continued, "the Committee has paid slight attention to any influences save those alleged to be Communist. It has recommended no specific legislation. . . . Its 'exposures,' however, have had the effect of making federal agencies exceedingly cautious in employing or retaining any persons who are under suspicion of Communist connections or sympathies."

The survey also noted that the reports of the Rapp-Coudert Committee, investigating alleged subversive activities in the New York City schools, along with equivalent investigating groups in California, Oklahoma and Colorado, were "almost exclusively confined to Communist influences."

"The primary result of all these committees," the report concluded, "has been to stir up confusion and prejudice, without either legislative or criminal action. . . . The Union and its affiliated committees have persistently opposed all of these inquiries into alleged subversive activities on the ground that they promote repression of political opinion."

Other items noted in the tendencies of the year were the comparatively few cases reported involving Communists, the many cases involving Jehovah's Witnesses, "the minority most subject to interference and attack," and the growing insistence of Negroes on their rights. The report commented that "cast upon the larger world stage of exploitation of the darker races in the colonies of the democracies, their cause in the United States is taking on a new significance in the conduct and aims of the war."

Other items in the report concern the German-American Bund, virtually dissolved, the rights of labor, conscientious objectors, freedom in schools and colleges, and censorship of radio, press, motion pictures, and the stage.

Officers of the Union are: Prof. Edward Alsworth Ross of the University of Wisconsin, national chairman; Dr. John Haynes Holmes, chairman of the Board of Directors; and Roger N. Baldwin, executive director.

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXVIII JULY, 1942 No. 5

EDITORIAL

We are not a warlike people, and we were not prepared for the present emergency. That we are not a warlike people is properly a source of pride; but that we were not prepared is a source of regret. Upon those who were most insistent that we be unprepared must rest the chief responsibility for the disasters incident to the first year or so of our war venture. A sense of propriety should suggest to these persons moderation in their appraisal of our current efforts. Also those who wanted more preparation than public opinion would support should not now engage in partisan criticism of the officials who had to take public opinion into account. Fair play at home will make for effective action abroad.

It is now evident that we are in for a long war and that our nerve will be subjected to the most severe tests. Doubtless conditions on the long battlefronts of the world will become worse for the United Nations before they become better. At home many and grievous errors will be made before we learn how to act more effectively. It is, therefore, important that we steel ourselves against the ill effects of reverses abroad and of errors at home. After the occurrence almost any critic can tell what should have been done; but only the subversive at heart will dwell with carping glee upon our reverses and errors. The task ahead is big enough to puzzle even the wisest. The Colonel McCosmics and the armchair critics know precisely what the strategy of battle should be, but those upon whom the responsibility rests must make decisions in the midst of uncertainty. Our great need is for the unity of purpose that can see above and beyond incidental occurrences. Sure triumph will ultimately follow only the complete commitment of the total moral and physical resources of the whole nation to the gigantic problem that confronts us all.

Curtis W. Reese

Editorial Comments

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

I

It is confusing—this business of trying to keep the right attitude toward this war. Apparently no matter what you do, you are bound to get in bad with various and sundry critics who themselves seem to be as badly confused as the rest of us. Thus, if you say that this is going to be a long, hard war, even as the President himself declares, then you are none the less denounced as a defeatist, or an out-and-out Nazi sympathizer. If, on the other hand, you say that Hitler is doomed, and join John Steinbeck in affirming that the free spirit of man cannot be destroyed by force and violence, then you are denounced again for spreading apathy and complaisance, and thus impeding the all-out war effort. If things get dark, as they did in March and April, then you are damned if you say so; and if things get brighter, as they did in May and early June, then you are damned again if you say so. What the prospect will be when these lines are printed, I cannot say. But this I know—that whoever ventures to describe the situation as it is, whatever it is, will be straightway himself described as a foolish optimist or a cowardly pessimist, and in both cases condemned as a traitor to his country's welfare. Something is wrong with us, that we allow ourselves to be torn asunder in this fashion, and I find this something in a total lack of the leadership to which the nation is entitled in an hour like this. Plenty of dominance, no doubt about that—plenty of pulling and hauling, and shouting and gesticulating, but little of that calm, serene command of the situation which would communicate itself quickly enough to the people and enable them to carry on without disturbance. As it is, the people are hectored and rebuked and shoved around, and all the while denied that knowledge of plan and policy so necessary to what Tennyson calls "one equal temper of heroic hearts." It is easy enough to blame the people for not being in the war, and for being discouraged at one moment and complacent at another. But how can they know what to do, or where to go, or how to feel, when no clear voice comes out of Washington, and all is uncertainty and doubt? What is needed at this moment more than any other one thing is what Lincoln called "a confidence in the people." Trust the people to know the worst and hope the best. Reveal to them the real nature of the project in hand. Make them partners in an enterprise which is their own, and for which after all they must pay the bill. Says Mrs. Anne O'Hare McCormick in the New York *Times*:

> Fluctuations of mood are certainly more noticeable in Washington than anywhere else in the country. . . . If the country veers from overoptimism to overpessimism, it is on the basis of the news released by official sources. . . . Washington misreads the popular mind. . . . The people want the truth.

II

It was at the annual Communion Breakfast of the Department of Sanitation Holy Name Society of Brooklyn and Queens, attended by 3,200 members of the Department, that the Reverend Aloysius McDonough, Professor of Theology at the Passionist Monastery at Jamaica, Long Island, pleaded for "a mediated peace." Professor McDonough, as reported in the New York *Times,* commended Pope Pius XII as the proper umpire between the warring nations "to establish a peace based on justice." Asserting that the Pope is the "only expert in morality and religion" trusted by all the parties to the present war, the speaker went on: "I submit for your consideration the proposition that the Holy Father of Vatican City is the best possible choice for a mediator in the current emergency." This address by a distinguished Roman Catholic scholar and prelate, made at an official gathering of the Church, has immense significance. It followed hard upon the appeal of His Holiness to the embattled nations for peace, to which I made due reference in these columns last month. This remarkable utterance by the Pope set the policy for the Church the world around. That policy is peace, an end to war, a restoration of the world before it is too late. And here is instant evidence of the swing of the Catholic Church to the support of this policy. The Church is patriotic and loyal—there will be no faltering in support of the nation's effort so long as the war goes on. But steadily now, under the express direction of the Holy Father himself, the pressure will be exerted on the government and on public opinion for "a mediated peace," and that pressure can be enormous. With all this I am, of course, in the fullest sympathy. Indeed, not since the war began, especially since we entered the war, has anything so encouraged me as this proclamation of the Pope that his heart in this dark hour is set on peace. This, of course, is nothing new, since Pope Pius has always been a potent opponent of war. He stands today only where he has always stood. But now he pleads anew, through his own mighty voice and through the Holy Church itself, for an end of strife. This is all the nobler, be it said, in the face of the horrors of outrage and persecution visited upon Catholics by the Nazi regime. But the Pope, faithful to his Lord, bears no hate and seeks no revenge. His thought is only for mankind in this hour of mankind's dire extremity.

III

I want wholeheartedly to endorse the action of the Federal Council of Churches in relation to the war-bonds campaign. Urging citizens "to accept ungrudgingly the greatly increased taxation which is necessary," and "to share in such self-denials as are required by

rationing," the Executive Committee of the Council appealed to all "to effect serious savings in personal expenditures in order to invest the savings in government bonds, *or* to make sacrificial gifts for the alleviation of the vast suffering resulting from the war." The alternative here clearly defined is inescapable. We must either invest our money in bonds for the prosecution of the war, *or* we must give our money for the relief of the suffering incident to the war. Since the Council spoke, the Treasury Department has offered a third alternative in the form of special bonds, not designated as "war bonds" or "defense bonds," and issued for civilian work as general certificates of indebtedness, which may be purchased by individuals who "object conscientiously to war." Thus is the way wide open, for pacifists and non-pacifists alike, to do their part in carrying, consistently with their conscience, the burden of the nation and the world. The Federal Council is further to be praised for what it said about the churches, "which," it announced, "we do not ask to engage in the selling of bonds." Here the Council follows a policy already accepted in England—that the churches shall not be dragged into the war effort. Some time ago a great war meeting was held in one of England's cathedrals. In answer to a newspaper comment that the precedent thus set should "bring our cathedrals all through the land into full use," Dr. J. H. Oldham, in his *Christian News-Letter,* retorted that "it is devoutly to be hoped that it will not." Said Doctor Oldham, who comes as near to expressing the Christian conscience of England as any man alive today:

> The existence of our cathedrals and churches is a witness to the worship of God enthroned above the nation. Their general use for national purposes would confuse the vital distinction between the spheres of the church and the earthly state. . . . What must never be lost sight of is that the worship of a holy God does not mean the endorsement of our own understanding of the national cause.

What this means is a reaffirmation of what Doctor Oldham calls, in this same statement, "the distinction between the claims of God and of Caesar." It also means a reaffirmation of the democratic principle of the separation of church and state.

IV

Events which have taken place since the above editorial was written go far toward proving that Doctor Oldham expresses the Christian conscience of America as well as of England. Certainly nothing since this war began has so cheered this pacifist heart as the action of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. and of the Northern Baptist Convention in refusing to become supporters of the present armed conflict of the nations. The comment of *Time* on what happened at these two gatherings is significant, if not wholly accurate: "Is America's war just and righteous? Yes, said the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. No, it decided twenty-four hours later." "Has the United States any business in the war at all? No, declared the Northern Baptists." Details of these events are more illuminating. At the Presbyterian meeting, the great General Assembly, a resolution was passed at the end of a wearisome day and when many delegates were absent, declaring that "the cause for which our nation is at war is just and righteous, and that our freedom, our culture and our historic faith are dependent on the outcome of this conflict." The next day the full spiritual implications of this resolution had sunk in, and there was rebellion. By a two-thirds vote the resolution was reconsidered, and the above statement withdrawn in favor of the substitution of the simple statement that "the nation had no alternative but to engage in this war." What happened at the Baptist Convention was still more dramatic. The delegates at this Convention voted on three successive motions. The first, which declared for "the defeat of the Axis," was voted down. The second, which read, "In this day of decision we reaffirm our allegiance to the government and people of the United States in the war in which thousands of our sons and brothers are engaged for the preservation and assured maintenance of those essential freedoms won by generations of heroic men and women"—this was tabled. An attempt to bring this resolution again before the Convention was voted down. And all this in the face of fervid and feverish patriotic oratory about "the 20,000 or 30,000 Baptist boys in the armed forces," and of a special message from President Roosevelt calling upon the Convention to throw "the mighty force of your splendid body fairly behind the prosecution of the war"! What these events mean can be accurately measured by remembrance of the last war, when the churches lashed themselves body and soul to the war-chariot of the government. The *Christian Century* sums it up admirably:

> What these bodies were striving to do was to act consistently with their Christian faith that the church of Jesus Christ is not at war. They were determined not to repeat the spectacle which all the churches presented in the last war—a spectacle which they have rightly come to regard with repugnance and shame.

Twenty years of pacifism, in other words, have not been in vain.

V

It is balm in Gilead, manna in the wilderness, to receive from England the *Christian Pacifist,* and note what the English pacifists say, and are permitted to say, in these dreadful times. The latest issue of this remarkable paper to come to hand is dated April, and it is an experience of freedom to read its contents. The opening editorial describes the disappointments of the war:

> Armed force is proving less helpful than was expected. It is a treacherous weapon, capable of as much mischief to the hand that wields it as to the enemy against which it is used.

Then follows an editorial entitled "War Upon Children,"—denouncing the blockading and bombing of Germany, "the most hideous and least heroic of weapons." The third editorial, "The Sword Slays the Soul," is based on the text, "He that takes the sword shall

perish with the sword," and pleads that "he who refuses to take up the sword need never fear it even when it is directed against himself." Then comes an editorial on "the alarming food shortage suffered by the occupied countries, asking that the hungry be fed; another on appeals by conscientious objectors in prison; another on women conscientious objectors; and a final one on Devere Allen's peace news service. Then appears an article, "A Two-Edged Sword," prepared for the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship—"the instruments of war are bombs, tanks, guns; the instruments of the Passion are nails that go through one's own hands, a spear that pierces one's own side, and a crown of thorns for one's own head." This is followed by "An Open Letter to Any Tribunal," written on behalf of conscientious objectors by Dr. Leyton Richards. A third article, by Sir Ernest Bennett, M.P., tells the old story of the Christian monk, Telemachus, who ended the gladiatorial games in Rome by throwing his unarmed body between the combatants. An article, "Interruption to Worship," tells how Pierre Cérésole, Founder of International Voluntary Service for Peace, arose in a church service to plead for peace. This is followed by a section, "International News," publishing reports from pacifist groups in Europe, China, South Africa, Canada, Australia, and the U. S. A. There is the usual "Correspondence" section containing brave letters, a column of prayers, a series of reviews of pacifist books and pamphlets, a humorous column, a column on the English Fellowship of Reconciliation by Canon Raven, and news notes from the F. O. R. in Scotland, the Baptist Pacifist Fellowship, the Methodist Peace Fellowship, the Angelican Pacifist Fellowship, and a peace society, Pax. This is the way they carry on in England—a pattern and example to us here!

VI

It pleases this stubborn old head and comforts this incorrigible old heart that somebody is at last speaking out, with authority, on this matter of honorary degrees at the college commencements. We have just been through one more season of the annual debauch, and the whole thing seems to be more a scandal than ever. I have said my say, in this column and elsewhere, full many a time, with no response of any kind. Why should anybody bother about a mere minister (or editor) speaking out of turn and in bad taste on educational matters? But here at last is an educator who feels as I do, and who testifies on the firm basis of inquiry that other educators feel the same way. The educator in question is Dean Stephen Epler, of the Southern Oregon College of Education, who has been looking into this thing, and blushes with shame at what he sees. "If honorary degrees had been given only to a Newton, a Darwin, an Einstein, and men of equal scholarly achievement," says the Dean in his report, as released by the American Council on Public Affairs, "the prestige of the system at the present time would be unquestioned." But the degrees are not prevailingly, or even frequently, given to such men. On the contrary, scholars are passed over in favor of "persons who had attained some practical or administrative success"—bankers, businessmen, politicians, men of large wealth "who acquired fortunes by methods . . . . harmful to the general welfare" or "came into possession of great wealth by the accident of birth," persons believed to be "influential in obtaining new students," persons currently popular, and in war time military officers. Democrats get fewer degrees than Republicans, "radicals of the extreme left wing fewer than extreme conservatives or reactionaries." The point is that scholarship is not decisive. Other influences are at work, and Dean Epler does not hesitate to name them. Primary is the desire to get "financial remuneration." Honorary degrees, in other words, are used by our colleges as bribes or baits for money. Next is the desire to secure "free publicity" and thus "advertise a college." Dominant, of course, is the tendency to float with the tide, as in wartime—which means that our educational institutions become mere "me too's" to the whims and fancies of the day. The world sets the standards, and the colleges and universities give their blessing. What wonder that a New Jersey college, not long ago, conferred an honorary degree on Bonzo, a "seeing eye" dog! Dean Epler calls for reform. Two-thirds of the authorities he consulted agreed that fewer honorary degrees should be awarded, and these for merit only. Last month's exhibition marked a new "low" in academic degradation. Perhaps the turn in the tide is at hand.

Jottings

Dr. J. H. Oldham, in his *Christian News Letter* (Oxford, England), quotes an Englishman who yearns for the day

> . . . when the sacred carcass of the Mikado will be dragged out of his palace and bayoneted at the door by British soldiers as his soldiers bayoneted our people. I would like to see him and all his responsible generals and politicians dealt with on the "eye for an eye and tooth for a tooth" principle.

I have seen no such hate as this expressed in this country, but the chances are it will come. Therefore the churches, as Doctor Oldham points out, must fight it to the end.

Mussolini now proposes to snatch Corsica, Nice, and Savoy from helpless France. The world never really understood the nature of a jackal until this man appeared!

The pendulum is swinging again in Libya—west, east, east, west. It seems to make no difference who does the fighting, whether Rommel or Auchinleck, neither commander does anything more than that famous king of France who first marched up a hill, and then marched down again. I respectfully renew the suggestion, first made in this column, that the two generals draw a line in the desert midway between their two forces, agree not to cross that line, and then call it a day.

When one reads that it is Hitler's ambition and determination to have all the breweries of Germany making fruit juices and milk drinks instead of beer, one is set thinking rather furiously about the whiskies that flow so freely and fully in this land.

At a recent meeting of the American Medical Association, two researchers announced that "able individuals, criminals, and schizophrenics" are conceived in the spring, fewer in summer and autumn. This might well persuade a woman, in quest of able offspring, to conceive in the spring. But how can she be sure she won't produce a criminal or a schizophrenic? Here is a pretty desperate gamble!

These two researchers also reported that in general boys are conceived "in periods of increasing cold" and girls "in periods of greater warmth." With a scarcity of fuel oil for domestic heating this coming winter, there would seem to be a prospect of an unusual number of male births in New York, Boston, and points east.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

The Social Man

KENNETH L. PATTON

It is dangerous to talk about the remaking and rehabilitating of mankind unless there is some well-considered ideal of the kind of man that we shall strive to become in our remaking. It is possible to remake man into something worse than he is, rather than into something better. The question would seem to be whether there is some central and dominant trend in human personality, the development of which will better capacitate man to become the cooperative citizen of a world-wide human brotherhood. Do we have a tangible ideal for the type of human nature that will possess the greatest value possibilities both for the individual himself and for the society in which he participates? Can we say that this kind of man will be better and happier than another kind of man? Recognizing the relativity of moral, ethical, and personality values, what do we have on which to base our preference for one kind of character rather than another?

Those religions which have founders with divine pretensions do not have to face this problem. They assume a divine revelation of the perfect man. All they need to do is to acquaint themselves with their model and pattern their lives after the perfect example. Such patterns are to be found in Jesus, Mohammed, Buddha, and others. The monks of Buddha and Jesus forswear the world and dedicate their lives to remaking themselves into the likeness of their masters. The ideals of their saviors in social relations, behavior, personal habits, and value judgments become fixed absolutes for them, and they have only the single problem of conformity.

But the skeptical Humanist does not agree as to the uniqueness and divinity of these saviors of mankind. To him they are merely fellow men, probably wiser than most and worthy to be admired and to be followed in some degree, but not the possessors of any final word or perfect judgment on the question of the goods of character and life. He may agree that many of their precepts are probably true, but it will be only because he finds them reasonable and workable. They would be true no matter who proposed them; their veracity is not dependent upon a divine author.

But the Humanist need not start from scratch in his search for a working model of humanity. He has the great storehouse of human history and experience from which to draw. His questions are practical and utilitarian in the broadest sense of those terms. He wants to know what kind of character works best in the production of all manner of human values: material, cultural, aesthetic, and spiritual.

There have been many ideals proposed, such as the "righteous man," the "man of God," the "happy warrior," the "business man," the "practical man," the "family man," the "man's man," and so forth. All of these have their proponents and arguments in their favor, but none of them seems to answer all the various needs of the ideal for personality. The term which best designates the essential character of the man who must be created for the new world is the "social man."

The fundamental assumption underlying the ideal of the social man is that man is a natural creature. If man is completely in and of nature, then his ideal self will almost necessarily be his social self. If, however, you start out with the idea that man is something more than nature, that he has a divine, God-given spiritual self that is often at war with his natural self and must conquer it to be saved, then the issue is complicated.

For Paul the ideal man is the spiritual man, standing opposed to the carnal man. Berdyaev, the Russian anthropologist and theologian, also holds to this view. He says that evolutionary naturalism fails to account for the most important fact about man, the fact that he is God-man, made in the divine image and through his divine freedom fallen away from God and in the need of God's grace to restore him to salvation. Here we have a paradoxical man, with two natures, the spiritual and the carnal, the divine and the sinful, fighting a tragic battle within him. In this framework the ideal man would not be the social man, but the saved man, the God-directed person. Salvation lies in a realm above adjustments in and contributions to human society. Paul would counsel us to flee the world. The Humanist says to embrace the world. The one ideal is

the man of God. The other ideal is the man of man, the social-human man.

So one basis of the ideal of the social man lies back in the demonstration of man as being in and of nature. The second basis lies in the thesis that man's self, his human nature, is a social product. The argument could be simplified in this manner: our human nature is formed in society, therefore the ideal nature of man must also be in and of society, and the ideal man will be a social man. If our human nature were really divine nature and came from God, then the ideal man would be the God-man.

No man lives unto himself alone. He finds virtue, ability, depth, wisdom, morality, aesthetic quality, love, imagination, inspiration, encouragement, and his lasting rewards and happiness only within the shared community of human society. The greatest man is the one with the greatest social consciousness, who gets the most out of the society of his fellows, and who gives the most back to that society. Any man who separates himself from communion with his fellows thereby cuts the veins by which growth, purpose, and humanity flow into his being. If through hate, mistrust, selfishness, littleness, pride, if in any manner he severs his human bonds, he insofar delimits the largeness and the fineness of his human nature. Without human associations we have no human nature in the beginning; the measure by which we continue to be in and of society determines the quality of our human nature in the end.

These statements have a dogmatic ring about them; this is necessarily so. The whole structure of the religion of man rests on these assumptions. Just as Jesus is the cornerstone of Christianity, so is the ideal of the social man the cornerstone of the religion of man. If this basic assumption is false, then is Humanism false. If this ideal is not dependable, then I know not by what standard we may evaluate either things or personalities.

The man sufficient unto himself is a fiction, the like of which has never been seen in earth or sky. Without the cooperation of father and mother he would not have possessed life in the first place. If immediately upon being born he had been thrown upon his own resources he would have shortly perished. Without the social contagion of fellow beings be would not have human nature. He would have no language by which to express himself, no symbols by which to handle abstractions and to think. He could not reason without the logical habits inherited from his culture. Without the association of men he would not have human emotions, expressions, and reactions. Except relative to other men, no man is wise, successful, famous, good, handsome—all our judgments and values are relative to the social scene. Our virtues and vices are social virtues and vices. Our measurements of worth are social.

Our intuitions lead us aright in this matter. Our real heroes are not the great warriors and captains of industry, although we may be transiently attracted to them. The real heroes of mankind are the great servants, the ones who give their lives for the good of all. The great heroes are the ones who make the greatest contribution to the common weal. We are attracted to the individuals who are kind, considerate, merciful, sacrificing; we are repelled by the cruel, inconsiderate, selfish, and asocial persons. The underlying reason for this is the fact that we are social creatures and our present and continued welfare lies in those forces that interrelate and interweave the lives of men in patterns of meaning and association. The good draws men together in sympathy and understanding; the evil separates men in competition and envy.

The good man is the person who possesses good qualities, who does good acts which eventuate in goods or values. It can be demonstrated that these values or goods that contribute to the person of the social man are evaluated on the scale of their sociality. Every good has a structure. A good is composed of a series of connections between people and things. The higher the good, the greater the number and the higher the quality of the connnections which make up the value or good. The highest goods are made up of many lesser goods, for each one of the connections in the value situation is a value itself.

This can be seen in the good of a friendship. The relation of two people has a structure. It is made up of many incidents and situations, of conversations, gifts, common interests, smiles, handclasps, similarities in background, and so forth. The structure of a friendship is cumulative, for the longer it continues the greater is the number of shared values and connections, and the greater is the understanding and appreciation in the relationship. As long as the connections are such that they draw the two closer together, the friendship grows. If unsocial connections, such as quarrels, misunderstandings, and selfish considerations intrude, the friendship is thereby weakened. If the friendship of two people can on the same level be made to include several more people the structure of the good becomes greater and possible of more values and variety. Married couples experience this. If marriage develops according to the social ideal, the couple grows ever closer together with a larger area of shared meanings, and as children come into the circle the family structure of values widens. The parents are further tied together in their mutual love and concern for the children, and the children are likewise woven into the texture of the social circle.

We may carry this illustration even further. The social circle can be widened to include several families. We see this in our attraction to our kin folk. Common parentage will continue to connect the children of a family even when they have become heads of families themselves, and thereby the structure of the individual family is included in a larger whole. And this can be implicated in the larger grouping of the community, where many family groups become interrelated and interconnected in a larger social whole.

The social man is the one who is not delimited in the area of his social connections. There are some men who are human within their own family and inhuman to those who are outside it. They delimit themselves when they so circumscribe the area of their association, interest, and affection. The ideal of the social man lies in one who can encompass the whole of the human race in the circle of his concern and love. He not only loves his own children; he loves all children. He not only likes the man across the street; he likes the man across the sea. He extends his community to include all humankind. He becomes a citizen and a neighbor of the world. He enters into the widest of all communities, the transcultural and transracial brotherhood of man.

It is evident that due to the limitations of the human body and mind a person cannot be equally close to all the men in the world. I have sat in a railroad

car, watching town after town roll by, and been depressed to realize the countless persons whose life my life would never touch. Man gets a feeling of smallness and unimportance when the immensity of the human family weighs upon him. But he can concentrate on the circle of his family and intimates, and let his concern and brotherhood go out in ever-widening circles to the ends of the world. For where man is delimited in time and body, he is marvelously blessed in imagination, sympathy, and understanding. Man can live on one acre, and yet live on the whole earth, aye, even in the whole universe.

The evil of provincialism and nationalism is that they tend to limit the areas of human association and community. The primary sin is not sin against God, but sin against the social nature of man. The greatest tragedy of all is the one we are now experiencing, the division of mankind into two military camps, each bent on the extermination of the other. This is fratricide. It is the drama of Cain and Abel magnified to horrible proportions. This is the evil that lies in all those forces that tend to divide men from each other.

Those who hold to what they call the Christian conception of man say that man's sin lies in his attempt to outstrip his own creaturehood and make himself God. They picture man as trying to escape his finite limitations and freedom, refusing to be subservient to the commands of God, and thereby destroying himself. In their own theological maze they are struggling for a solution to a perplexing problem. But the answer would not seem to lie in explaining human perversity as a defection from the infinite guidance of God. The problem is more tangible when we look upon man as natural and social.

Man's primary weakness lies not in denying his creaturehood before God, but in denying his social nature before man. Man destroys himself, not when he denies God, but when he denies society. When a man cuts off the flow of his life's blood, communion with his fellows, his character becomes gangrenous and corrupted, and he invites spiritual death.

The ideal of the social man has inevitable implications for every area of life. Just in so far as we divorce any of our labor and interest from meaning in the common social context do we narrow the ranges of our being. Our great contemporary weakness is the inclination to abstract certain occupations and interests from their social implications. We talk about "art for art's sake," and that you "can't mix religion and business," as if it were possible to create a special vacuum free from social forces and influences in which certain things can be pursued without concern for their results. Some would remove science from the welter of the world to the laboratory of pure research. In art they talk about "self-expression," as if one's self were something out of this world.

Let us look at art in this light. An art is a language. It is a way of making certain meanings within one appreciable to other persons. Art has no meaning outside the area of social communication. Why is the poet so worried as to whether the particular word or phrase "says" just what he feels? Why does the painter toil to make his color and design express just that overtone of emotion which seems important to him? Why does the musician pile sound upon sound to depict the fluid turbulence within him? Why do they feel this urge for expression? Because they wish to communicate what is within them to other people. The honest artist admits this. Why are artists so anxious to publish and perform? Why is the artist the most fame-hungry and exhibitionist of persons? Because in him this urge to make others understand and comprehend what is in him is most acute. It is basically a social and communicative drive. They have the same coercion as does the young man who must convey the importance of his love to the young lady. There is neither love nor art without an ear to whisper into. The greatest art is that which makes the most profound and deepest meanings and feelings comprehensible to the greatest number of people. This we call universal art. It might more accurately be called social art.

The fault of business lies in separating manner of production from the scene of personality values, and abstracting the goods produced from their importance in the lives of men and women. Things are not produced primarily because they will better the life and spirit of man, but because they will make profit. Working conditions can be brutalizing and inhuman if they will increase production. We do not have to cease being social, human beings when we become workers. Business must become a social and cooperative enterprise, productive of values of fellowship and sociality in all its functions, manufacturing, distributing, and creatively meeting the highest needs of the consuming public.

The underlying difference between lust and love is just this matter of being selfish and exclusive, as against being social and sharing. The man with lust thinks of little else than satisfying his own appetite, even if it brings suffering and degradation to his fellows and to himself. He separates his satisfaction from the good of the social whole and tries to live unto himself alone. The one who loves is also seeking self-satisfaction in some degree; that is inevitable and healthy. But the loving person is as much or even more concerned with the satisfaction and happiness of others. Therefore his desires draw him into the circle of fellow meanings and goods, while lust drives one apart from the group into lonely self-importance, where in the end there can be only bitterness, darkness, and satiety. Love builds itself into an ever-higher and more social form; it is creative and growing and cumulative. Lust tends to destroy the capacity and source of the very satisfaction it seeks. When we say that sin is the violation of one's social nature we can say that the wages of love is life, and the wages of sin is death.

Crimes are expressions of lust. One can selfishly lust for many things, and steal them. One can lust for personal vengeance and kill. The basis of crime is the placing of self-consideration above social consideration; it violates the sociality of man. In this wise, the nature of one's social self depends on the group in which one is a social part. The member of a gang may be a very social person within the gang, and be a real menace to society as a whole. Therefore the ideal of the social man carries with it a complementary ideal of social societies. Groups of men will be judged by the same criteria by which individuals are judged. Do they contribute to the larger social whole? Just as the asocial person is self-destroying, so is the asocial group, whether it is a local gang or a nation. The wider social whole cannot tolerate this defection from the common good; therefore the group must be restrained for the good of the community, and the nation for the good of the world-wide human society.

In the ideal of the social man there is a fusing of the

issues of selfishness and altruism. For the man who has caught the vision of this ideal there is no longer any problem in this matter for him. He realizes that his own good and happiness are really the good and the happiness of the group. In self-realization, he inevitably realizes the social good, and turn about. When he becomes selfish, he becomes self-destructive. Therefore, he arrives at a conception of enlightened selfishness, in which he finds his own welfare inextricably fused with the welfare of the group. He never works simply for the good of himself or the good of another; he works for the good of the society of which he is an integral part. He knows himself for what he is, a social man, and therein he finds his self-realization and completeness.

Herein he finds the deep meanings of existence. His egotistical self-importance begins to fade away. The concern for self-survival diminishes as he becomes more concerned in the survival of others. He builds his life so completely into the lives of others that he can be said to live on in them when he dies. When he so integrates his life into the social whole, he insures himself against utter defeat and tragedy. If a man loves only a few people and puts all his affection and values in them, when they die he might as well be dead. But when one loves not only a few dearly, but also has a love and loyalty for a larger group, although the loss of those nearest to him will be an incalculable loss, he will not be wholly destitute. He still has others for whom to live. If his life is truly one with the whole, personal defeat and failure will not be so poignant. There will be those to share his defeat and failure, and he is never wholly defeated as long as society still moves onward.

For the social man, even the sting of death is gone. He is content to have had his small part in the enterprise. He is happy that he has given life and aid to those who live after him. He has made his life something not circumscribed by his single body; his real life has been one with his fellows. He will step aside to let another have the small piece of earth on which he has walked. He will welcome others to the sunlight and air that were his, hoping that they will find in life the sweetness and fellowship that he knew. His great sadness will not be that he enters oblivion, but that he can no longer share the adventures of those he loves. But in them he will have found a sufficient immortality to know that life is ever young, ever starting over fresh and fair. He will know that he has found man's highest freedom, the freedom to give and share. When he dies it is only the lesser part of himself that dies; his society lives on. He leaves himself behind, for he has become more than one man; he has become the social man. This is the high mystical outreach of man's being, to know himself to be one with all men, to be immortalized in his children, and their children, in his friends and neighbors, as long as men shall walk arm in arm on the green of the earth.

Spiritual Values in World Organization

DOROTHY BUSHNELL COLE

We hear much these days about the United Nations, of the need for pooling our resources, of a unified command, of standing together with our Allies. These things are of the essence of victory, of winning the war, of stopping aggression. But when we have talked of pooling our resources we have thought in terms of manpower and materials. This is of course important, so far as it goes, important for winning the war. But this time many observers, not least among them our great president, talk of winning also the peace; and I contend that to win the peace, we must, while waging the war, start the pooling of our *spiritual* resources, that this pooling is also of the essence of victory, of that second victory, that of the peace, without which that of the war will be meaningless and futile.

Recently I was asked to take part in a panel discussion on the subject, "Can We Build a Christian World Order?" My answer was, "Yes, provided we forget the label 'Christian,' but with a Christian spirit in our hearts set out to study and make our own all that which is so beautiful and so spiritually sound in the religions and cultures of our Allies that it should be made part and parcel of the new world order which we hope to establish on the ashes of the war." Today I am moved to write because I have just read of Dr. Ricardo Rojas, Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy and Letters at the University of Buenos Aires. Doctor Rojas has grown to feel himself to be neither Catholic nor Protestant, but merely Christian. This crystallized in me the conviction that I feel myself to be not nearly so much Christian or Jew, Hindu or Mohammedan, Democrat or Bolshevik, as I feel myself to be anti-fascist. We have no word for it yet. Anti-fascist will not do. Even the term "United Nations" smacks at this stage too much of mere manpower and materials. We do not want merely to be *against* something.

We will let the matter of the name wait, then, until we have examined the quality, the nature, of our spiritual pool. Into it will go the teachings of our own Christian West, which means some of Europe and our own great hemispheres, both Catholic and Protestant, and I ask "What will be taken from *us,* what is *worth* taking?" I do not mean to pose as a student of theology or of foreign cultures, I merely record these thoughts as a prelude to study. But, superficially I describe Christianity on the whole as a belief in the brotherhood of man, in the idea that salvation comes through love, through kindness, that a person can find himself through losing himself in the service of others. Also I feel Christianity to be a very personal religion, preoccupied largely with the individual's relationship to his Creator or his Savior; good works, yes; love of neighbor, yes; but more of an identification of oneself with one's Creator than *with* the neighbor or the brother.

It is hard to say which of our Allies is the greatest, but let us turn to China. Is there anything here opposed to Christianity, or is the emphasis merely different? We see here a great people, ancient in culture, vast in numbers, whose principal preoccupation has been not so much with their Creator, not with the thought of a hereafter, but more especially with the problem of getting along with each other here and now, a great people with their feet on the ground, devoted to learning, to making the machinery of human society work; a people who in order to survive have developed good manners to the highest point achieved anywhere

on earth, and to whom common courtesy and etiquette coincide with life itself. In pooling our spiritual resources, we will more and more turn to the Chinese to learn adequate and appropriate techniques for living together daily and getting along with each other.

Before we go on, let us go back. In the Christian West, especially in the Anglo-Saxon bloc of it, we see a great capacity for self-government. We see the town meeting, the parliamentary system, the rule of the majority, the free elections. All these are doubtless outgrowths of that Christian ideal of the value of each individual, of the spark of the divine which is in us all. But I have often smiled at the thought of our first contacts with China, which we considered backward, barbaric, primitive, and uncivilized because she was organized on a family basis and had no central government such as we knew that could negotiate with us. She had worked the whole thing out with what facilities she had. Surely democrats must see the value of letting the oldest member be the head of a family. Sooner or later everyone will have a chance at it, everyone will some time be the oldest, and all can profit by the wisdom gleaned by the oldest through so many years. And then when the oldest of all the families get together to form the Elders of each little community, they have a governing body different from ours, but one that works and has worked well for hundreds of years, and everyone has his chance.

Perhaps in Russia we see, also, a preoccupation with the here and now, with the problem of mankind, that is comparable to that of China. A detailed account of just wherein those preoccupations differ is not in the province of this article. Russia has set out with force to form a better world, whereas China has conformed and conformed in order to survive. But let us never lose sight of the fact that in both cases the better world is to be for the people, the masses, all the individuals in society; in short, for the idea and because of the idea of brotherhood.

The Mohammedan, too, has his idea of heaven, an idea that has often seemed too wordly, too material, too sensuous to his Christian brother, but let us not forget that the Mohammedan's heaven was the kind that would naturally be conceived by a starved, a desert, a nomadic people, whose here and now lacked luxury, comfort, and plenty. And let us never forget that along with the Mohammedan's idea of the one God is the accompanying dream of the brotherhood of man, and that he looks a little askance at his Christian neighbor who preaches but does not practice a doctrine of racial equality.

Finally we come to India whom most of us know to be our great ally in spite of some doubts and confusions at this writing. These will soon be dissipated. India is the great spiritual storehouse of the world, different from all the others; profound, steeped in wisdom, in mysticism, in understanding of the Universe and its processes. If the Chinese and the Russian identify themselves with their fellowmen, and if the Christian and the Mohammedan identify themselves both with their fellowmen *and* their God, their Creator, what about the Indian, the Hindu? Does not he identify himself with the whole process of the Universe, with the here and now, the before and the hereafter, the living and the dead, life animate and inanimate, vegetable and animal, is not he himself *and* his brother, his neighbor, all-in-one? Life is short in India, and dangerous, and the Indian has sought for meanings beyond the grave, apart from the grave, meanings we do not always understand, cannot understand, and which sometimes baffle and confuse us. But India is a great ally, to which we must go humbly, quietly, studiously, with open mind; an ally that will contribute much to the peace if we will listen to her; an ally to whom, by the very force of numbers, we cannot but listen. We must not go to her empty-handed. We must not ask if we can build a Christian world order. Rather, must we forget the label "Christian," and emphasize the Christian spirit of love and tolerance and desire for understanding.

We hear much about the necessity for policing the world when the war ends. We hear how the responsibility for the job will fall largely on the Anglo-Saxon nations. I have the utmost respect for the scholars who enunciate this point of view, have followed them day by day in their reasoning, but I have grown a little fearful of it. I would rather say that doubtless the weapons used by the police force in establishing order will be fabricated in Anglo-Saxon countries, but, with the war won, with the manpower of China, of India, of Russia so largely responsible for that victory, why cannot the policing be a joint affair, why must we think of it in terms of the Anglo-Saxon nations? I am afraid, too, that if we continue to do this we shall make the mistake of thinking of the peace in terms of an Anglo-Saxon peace, shall demand parliamentary systems that smack too much and too entirely of the New England town meeting, and we shall wonder why we cannot get together with our great Allies.

Those of us who are interested in the peace—and who pray is not?—should begin at once a program of profound study, that this should be accompanied by what we might call a Christian-Anglo-Saxon soul searching. It does not matter how much we like our system, or how superior we may consider it to all other systems; what does matter is that if we hope to incorporate what is best in our own system into the new parliament of the world, into the new government of the family of nations, we must approach the whole problem of peacemaking with humility, with understanding, with wisdom, tolerance, and patience. Let us not forget that the Christian West will be the minority group at the peace table, that our sins committed in the name of racial fastidiousness stand out like plague spots in the fabric of our would-be contribution.

Hitler knows that if he can drive a wedge of suspicion and doubt and misunderstanding between us and our Allies his chances for victory are greater. How easily he will try to jump from sowing seeds of mistrust in the war effort to sowing similar seeds in the peace effort! What we must realize, and what we must never lose sight of, is the fact that there is something in each of the religions and cultures of the United Nations which strikes a responsive chord in the other; some emphasis, some harmony that can unite us, must unite us; some conviction, regardless of what type of terminology it is couched in, that the human spirit is worth preserving, that the human and humane values are of the divine; that the great creative force in all humanity must be safeguarded and cherished.

Perhaps my point becomes more obvious when we see clearly that opposed to all this is the philosophy of destruction, of nihilism, of master-slave relationship, of the right to make aggression—a philosophy founded on the proposition that people are not equal and that government of them, by them, and for them is a monstrosity.

"The Mark of the Beast"

EDWARD H. REDMAN

On a recent trip to Maine I had occasion to visit a small town in which much of my boyhood was spent, and, for the sake of renewing old friendships and seeing again those whom I had known so well, one Sunday morning I went to the little white frame church on the hill which overlooks the village. A new minister had come to the parish, not one of the seminary students who usually have been the supplies, but an exhorter, a farmer who had received a call to preach the Word. Now it is indeed contrary to the liberal temper to hold the convictions of men in ridicule, but this man is an example of dozens of his kind that I have heard in rural pulpits down East. What they preach, and the influence they have upon the people, however, represents a problem which gravely affects the religious life of the whole nation. For the sake of reviewing one great influence upon the popular mind, for the purpose of comparing this popular religion with what I believe to be the distinctive message of liberal religion, I shall report for you the substance of this exhorter's sermon.

In announcing his topic of the morning the preacher was careful to remind his people that he intended to discuss, not the *mark* of the beast as it is called in the Revelation of John, but rather the *marks* of the beast. His apparent purpose was to make a distinction between the anti-Christ and the ante-Christ, as he put it. However, his sermon became so involved in scriptural references that one could not well follow the distinction between the two terms. By the use of Scripture he told us that the marks of the beast were learning, disbelief in the divinity of Christ, and last, but by no means least, a Jewish countenance. As for learning, he said that he could not understand how good Christian people could give their lifetime savings to theological schools, because all that theological schools were doing was to teach individual anti-Christs how to quote Scripture. "You must believe in the whole Bible," we were told, "because anything less than the whole Bible is again the tool of the Devil." If one is a Christian, if one has been saved, you can tell by just looking at him,—that is, you can tell if you yourself have been saved. "That," said the preacher, "is the gift of the Spirit which I received when I was saved." Finally after devious peregrinations from verse to verse, during which all in the congregation who had dutifully brought their Bibles hastily perused each passage referred to, the preacher made his summary interpretations. The ante-Christ was the political state and the anti-Christ was the Church which succeeded it. These were the sum of the *marks* of the beast.

Now one would not seriously present this as the outline of a perfectly organized sermon, nor did it have the usual pattern of a discourse to expound the meaning of a difficult bit of Scripture. What this man had produced that Sunday morning was merely a thinly disguised sublimation of his own personal qualifications and a depreciation of those of everyone else. If one were to overlook the vulgarities of his speech, the evil smirk on his face when he punctuated a point by remarking that if one believed this or that why then of course one was anti-Christ because the Bible says so, and if one were to disregard even the anti-Semitism of his remark that the final anti-Christ would be a Jew because Jews are like that, there would still be much to give consternation to one committed to a more liberal faith.

This sermon may seem to be an extreme instance of fundamentalist Protestantism. I hope that it is, but we may well be certain that if such as this is happening in the rural churches of major denominations, then how much the more is it the case in the rapidly growing fundamentalist sects which we have been prone to dismiss by calling them the "lunatic fringe." Just as in France religion has been identified with the Roman church by very definition of the word religion, so likewise in our own country, in far too many cases, religion has been defined by the fundamentalists, and, apart from the rather few liberals, it has been believed that, unless one has been saved, he cannot be a religious man.

Perhaps you may think that the old fundamentalist-modernist controversy belongs to the nineteenth century, that that struggle, at least, is one in which we need no longer engage. We sometimes become so engrossed with our forward-looking programs of social betterment that we are inclined to forget the intensity with which both parties engaged in the controversy between religion and science. It is obviously true that among the educated classes science was victor and religion among the elite became more reasonably interpreted. However, the academy does not include all who enter the market place. Not yet has the educational process penetrated to the bottom of society, and there are still widespread areas in which its impact has been scarcely felt. It even seems that the degree of understanding which one may possess bears little relationship to the amount of formal schooling, for one may read only to yawn, and then what becomes of the reading? Some persons have pointed out that the victory of science in that ancient struggle was in itself a victory for the fundamentalist attitude because science came to be accepted on faith in the dogmatic statement of its principles. Science won, but the religion which it defeated was the religion defined by the fundamentalists. The battle was an intellectual one, and when faith in faith gave way to faith in reasonableness, those who could not accept the new faith simply retained the old one on non-intellectual grounds. For those of the new faith who derive their knowledge from what they read and hear alone there is little chance for contact with the minds of those of the old religion, because those of the old religion are not the authors of learned or even of unlearned books. It is only on those occasions when some teacher is suddenly confronted with the charge of illegal teaching of evolution that attention is suddenly focused upon what are regarded as vestiges of a defeated cause.

The real measure of the vitality of fundamentalism, it seems to me, lies in the fact that its definition and conception of religion still remains the predominant one even for those enlightened students who reject religion entirely. It is, I think, an evidence of the tenacity of fundamentalist ideas of religion that is to be uncovered whenever the common man challenges a theological student to explain how it happens that he is planning to enter the ministry. The fundamentalist attitude toward religion is in evidence, I believe, whenever it is said that religion is outmoded and is no longer essential in the life of man. Why do these things represent the persistence of fundamentalism? Because the underlying assumption in each case is that religion involves certain unreasonable attitudes toward life, knowledge,

and nature, that religion involves the practice of certain ridiculous acts of self-abasement in the presence of one's acquaintances, of giving testimony to the grace of God in saving an evil man from those sins which must be publicly enumerated and described at prayer meeting each Wednesday evening.

The endurance of the fundamentalist conception of religion is further manifest in the religious life of those who have reacted from it to join the ranks of the unchurched. Believing that the old religion is no longer valid, many have rejected it without discovering the new and more reasonable religion to take its place. When fair weather prevails and the outlook of the moment is of a brilliant future, when one is still in his youth, when jobs are plentiful, and when the stock market is stable, these people can surmount the ordinary problems of life without their rejected faith, but what happens when a crisis comes, when youth fades away, when a job is lost, and when the market crashes? Then we see just the nature of their rejection of religion in all its crass superficiality. Some of these, in the moment of trial, re-enter the fold of the saved in penitence and in the joy of regaining acceptance among the self-elect. Others of more hardened heart madly search for newer, quicker, and surer means of salvation. They join the cults, they seek out and devour with greed and gullibility all the esoteric mysteries handed down from the past and everything that man can invent to deceive the people of the present. They become the dupes of theosophical racketeers, or they make themselves the laughing stock of their neighbors by confessing their peccadillos at public house parties. The names of the cults are legion, and the cash which is mulcted from their adherents each year makes the burden of ecclesiasticism pale before it.

We, as Unitarians, liberals in religion, ought, it seems to me, to be doing more in the face of this situation than we have been doing. In a degree we, too, have had our pure gospel of reasonableness, educated opinion, and lip service to democratic freedom. In proportion to our members we have played more than has been our share in the role of leaders of social thought and action. I do not think it unfair to say that in large part the liberalizing forces now at work within other denominations have been due to the influence of our leadership in the general cultural and philosophical movements in America of the nineteenth century. The question before us is: Have we fulfilled our mission by what has already been accomplished, or is ours the task of carrying on to new horizons those attitudes of mind and those conceptions of religion which liberate rather than enslave the minds of the people? Is it enough for us to preach the liberal gospel in our pulpits to those who come to church on Sunday, or do we have a larger task? Are we to remain from now on just a nucleus of liberals adrift in a world of powerful currents and eddies of irrationality and unreason?

The answer to these questions is certainly that we do have a larger task to perform. We cannot well afford to hold our oars and drift with the tide. We must row our boat with uniform, coordinate, and powerful strokes, or we shall be overwhelmed. Even with the utmost effort it may be that we shall be swamped by the mountainous waves of reaction in our time; therefore, it behooves us to expend all the more effort if only for self-preservation. However, the future may not be as dark as it now appears, and there is room for hope that diligence on our part may not only preserve us but also advance our cause. An example of activity already entered upon by our denomination in this direction is the work of the Unitarian Service Commission. Yet, while the kind and quality of work which is being done in the international arena is excellent, it does not fully answer the challenge to action which lies before us. Tragic though the condition of the refugee most certainly is, even more tragic is the hopelessness of the situation of large numbers of our own oppressed population in rural areas almost throughout our nation, and little less tragic is the fate of many of our industrial workers in our manufacturing cities and towns.

You may wonder what on earth can be the relationship between American social conditions and the questions raised by the enduring vitality of fundamentalism. That relationship is two-fold: On the one hand, it is the opiate of fundamentalism that has conditioned our native Americans to accept hardship and poverty in this life in the hope of alleviation in the life to come; on the other hand, fundamentalism has contributed its share to the ethics of thrift and sharp-dealing which has forced the poor into greater poverty and has brought the rich to greater wealth. In many a New England town, for example, one can see the wealthiest townsman together with his own blood brother, the most poverty-stricken townsman, worshipping together in the same congregation, but rare is the family in which charity begins at home to the extent that the rich man will give more than a pittance to alleviate his brother's wants. If kinship cannot draw mercy, what other human ties could possibly be strong enough to do so? But from the point of view of fundamentalism there is no need for assuming social responsibility. It is assumed that God has willed that some men should suffer, that wealth is evidence of virtue in the eyes of God, and that God will reward the few virtuous men who have suffered by special rewards in Heaven.

To be sure, all men of wealth and thrift are not included in the fundamentalist ranks, nor are we including in our complaint those who have exercised such a stewardship of their resources as to recognize their responsibility for those in distress. Many of our own liberals are custodians of resources greater than those of the more successful of the fundamentalists, but it is to be hoped that they will continue to hold a wider view of the character of their stewardship and exercise it at least for the ultimate benefit of discreet philanthropies. Such has frequently been the case in the past and the history of our movement is replete with names of those who have given of their substance for the endowment of institutions dedicated to the liberating of men from their ignorance, from their physical handicaps, and from their hunger.

We have suggested already that the struggle between fundamentalism and liberalism should be carried on in the arena of social change. We have also pointed out that liberalism has already had its influence on the Protestant denominations generally. One further consideration needs to be given by way of a constructive proposal for activity. It is this. We cannot, as liberals, successfully invade the rural areas with our distinctive message. The people there are not prepared for it any more than they have thus far been prepared for taking any strong stand in their own self-interest. But others can do the sort of thing that Claude Williams, a fundamentalist preacher inspired by reading Doctor Dietrich's sermons, is doing with the sharecroppers in Arkansas. The whole Bible, about which the exhorter in our opening illustration was talking, contributes more to liberalism than to fundamentalism when it is so

used. Now we could not possibly enter upon a plantation and preach our gospel to gain a hearing, but someone else who knows the fibre and the needs of those people can preach to them a gospel of social liberation. First things must necessarily come first. When the oppressed once understand that they have been deprived of their birthright through listening to the hireling exhorters of the plantation holders, when they have once gained social and economic freedoms, when they have been enabled to secure some book-learning, then will be a time for missionary work in liberal religion. Until then, however, we should be willing to give freely of our resources in assisting those courageous men who have already undertaken the task of bringing the good news of freedom through organization to the sharecroppers.

In the industrial areas we should again deal with first things first. We cannot readily invite the unemployed and the laborers into our churches. They would not be prepared to come; they would feel ill at ease; our service of worship would not bring comfort when the pangs of hunger and malnutrition are fierce; their ragged clothing they would compare with the finery of the congregation about them. But ought we to rest content with this dismissal? I think not. We may not be able to invite them here, but we can go to them. We can find meeting places near their ill-furnished, damp, poorly-heated tenements. We can discuss with them the practical problems of their situation. We can talk to them about what other working people have done elsewhere to improve their lot. We can work with their unions and help them rid their unions of the blight of racketeering. When they see what we stand for and hold to be good, they will give heed to our religious message as well. When they discover that our church is not founded with the purpose of taking their tithe and that alone, they will be ready to join with us on the path to nobler thoughts and the healthy religion of humanity.

Now we are prepared to restate our discussion by way of conclusion. The fundamentalist exhorter, in failing to give the whole Bible truly, confused his categories, and we have turned the tables upon him. The beast has only one mark, and that mark is inhumanity. The marks which he ascribed to the beast and to the anti-Christ are in truth the marks of great humanitarians: learning, an emphasis upon the humanity of Christ rather than his divinity, and an appreciation of the contribution which the Jewish people have made to mankind. We may, with remorse perhaps for our own intolerance in saying so, declare that the mark of the beast in our time is fundamentalism.

Present Problems and Ancient Wisdom

VICTOR S. YARROS

Some educators, notably President Hutchins of the University of Chicago and his admirers, attach extraordinary importance to the Greek, Roman, and early Christian classics. To study these, we are told, is to receive the best part of a liberal, humanistic education. No enlightened person will dispute the value and weight of the ancient wisdom embodied in the works of Plato, Aristotle, St. Thomas Acquinas, for example, or of the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures, and no generation should be left in ignorance of these and similar books.

Yet those who believe that ancient wisdom has enabled us, or can enable us, satisfactorily to wrestle with and solve our own actual problems, moral and social, do not offer any evidence of the validity of their faith. In truth, there is no such evidence. Hegel said that history teaches us nothing, and Spinoza pointed out that ideas, no matter how authoritative they are assumed to be, cannot prevail over human passions and urges. Ample experience establishes the fact that ancient wisdom does not yield much help to those of the present period who are seeking just and reasonable solutions of serious and difficult contemporary problems. Such solutions have to be formulated in the language of the time and according to the spirit, logic, and intellectual climate of the time. Ancient wisdom is admired in the abstract but hardly ever applied to concrete instances.

The writer of these lines knows men and women who have acknowledged deep and high obligations to William James, Prof. John Dewey, Prof. William G. Sumner, Jane Addams, Prof. Alfred N. Whitehead, and Bertrand Russell, and who have sincerely tried to practice the principles laid down respectively by the distinguished educators just named. He has never heard any industrialist, banker, lawyer, labor leader, editor, teacher say that he has sought to follow the teachings of Plato or St. Thomas Acquinas. Ancient wisdom, like the wisdom of the oft-quoted proverbs, is too general, too vague, too slippery.

Has Plato ever persuaded an employer opposed to unions and to collective bargaining to change his policy and cheerfully accept the Wagner Labor Relations Act? Has anybody ever joined a picket line because of a memorable affirmation in an ancient book? Has any conservative embraced the New Deal because of something found in the Bible?

Such illustrative queries might be multiplied indefinitely. No; influence on conduct must be more direct, more immediate, and ideas must be applied to known situations and cases. The school that does not allow its educators to discuss and express positive convictions regarding labor questions, taxation, public control, monopoly, special privilege, dishonesty in business, corruption in politics, ripe social and economic reforms, and the like, totally fails in its functions, and no amount of ancient wisdom in a vacuum, as it were, will serve as compensation. We need justice, reason, and righteousness *here and now,* and we need these virtues where resistance to them is strongest—in impersonal and corporate industry and commerce. Our educators and moralists must know modern economic relationships and forms of organization. Plato and St. Thomas did not. Jesus did not. To quote them is vain and futile. They get lip service, and the modern plutocrat or royalist proceeds serenely on his customary way, including Sunday church services, as a rule.

Take Micah's beloved formula. All that God expects of us is to do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly before him. Who will take exception to this general statement? But what does justice require of the employer, the stockholder, the manager, the director, the banker, the broker? What about rent, interest and

profit, or reduction of output to increase prices? What about overcapitalization of industries and utilities? As to mercy, what about capital punishment, life sentences, penitentiary conditions, enforced idleness in prison? Are these things manifestations of love of mercy? Humility, as a virtue, is commended by everyone but exemplified by few, very few.

No, again, ancient wisdom will *not* solve *our* burning problems. The study of the great books of the past in schools and colleges will not graduate just and progressive citizens, politicians, employers, or labor leaders. A very different type of educational system will have to be developed if we are to succeed in training men and women of good will, sympathy with the disinherited, a passion for justice and humanity. It is not enough to insist, as some do, that education must be liberal and humanistic, and not unduly vocational or practical. Here, too, what is needed is a very frank and fairly full bill of particulars. Education must aim deliberately at humanizing our economic system, at eliminating legal and illegal privilege, at doing away with unemployment, at removing fear of poverty and destitution in old age or sickness, at extending, vitalizing, and deepening the concept of democracy, at preserving freedom—all the freedoms—while guaranteeing a high degree of security.

Are Big Business and the professions which serve and support it prepared to accept and welcome such an educational system? If not, the cultural outlook is dark and discouraging. But the educator and the liberal in and out of the system should courageously demand the radical improvements indicated, and promote them to the extent of their opportunities and powers. Without the right type of education, the right type of democracy is impossible. Ancient wisdom is a very poor foundation for genuine modern democracy. Modern wisdom and modern Humanism can furnish the requisite foundation.

A World of Free Men

Have you ever considered a world of men,
Of men who are honest and free,
Who love the adventure of life as it is
And live it abundantly,

Who bow not before an avenging god,
Nor grovel in penitence,
Who fear not opinion or dogma or creed,
Nor the sham of the mystic's pretense,

But men, honest men, who search for the truth
On an ever expanding plan
And strive to move on in accord with that urge
Inherent in every man,

And men who are free, both in body and mind,
And who never attempt to escape
Their duties to man and without any heed
To his size or his color or shape.

The fact you've considered a world of men,
Of men who are honest and free,
Brings hope and assurance that such a world
Shall exist eventually.

OSWELL G. TREADWAY.

Liberal Faith and Wartime Duty

CLYDE D. WILLIAMS

The duties of Unitarians in an America at war are clear. We have always declared the concerns of religion to be as broad as life itself, and as deep as the abyss of human need. In happier times we have gloried in our freedom to meet the opportunities of life unhampered by creeds and dogmas that would shut religion up in a compartment away from the world. It is incumbent upon us as true liberals now to demonstrate that, as our faith has been broad enough to open itself to every living impulse of life's promise, so also are we strong enough in our faith to stand our high ground against the perils of life that are inseparable from its promise.

Today those perils have suddenly become frightfully real and immediate. The treacherous attack that has been launched against our great nation is aimed directly at those things which men and women of the true and incorruptible liberal spirit have given to the world: the great Freedoms from which emerge the true dimensions of the human soul—freedom of speech and expression, freedom of opportunity, freedom of religious worship, and freedom of personal and social aspiration—which have made America in a deeply representative sense the commonwealth of hope for the world. As we labor and fight to defend our country, we shall be working and fighting for the principles which Unitarians, in a peculiar sense, hold dear and inviolable.

You have noted that I spoke of our duties in "an" America at war. This implies that at different times and in different circumstances this America of ours has undergone certain changes in its temper. Does anyone doubt that there has been an electric transformation of our American spirit since the first death-dealing blow was struck on that fateful Sunday? At bottom our character as a free people has remained firm and true, in spite of the many disquieting symptoms of fear and irresolution that have appeared on the surface—yes, even in spite of the apparent disharmony in our collective sense of America's purpose and destiny. But it was not until the full might of ruthless aggression had been hurled against our own shores that our national character re-asserted itself in the aroused will of a united nation to face all the enemies of liberty at their worst, and to overcome them as the mightiest champion of freedom in the world. No longer can anyone seek the illusion of safety by pretending that the attacks upon freedom are the mere propaganda of "warmongers," simply because they occurred in other lands thousands of miles away. America is attacked; and she rises to defend herself, strengthened in the knowledge that she stood for peace as long as peace remained anything more than a mockery. It is now the most urgent duty of every religious liberal to pledge himself to the cause of keeping this newly aroused America true to the religious principles upon which her life is founded.

Much has been heard in the last year about the difficulty, if not the impossibility, of preserving democracy in a nation at war. We must admit that the

difficulty will be of grave proportions. But was it ever guaranteed in the nature of things that we should enjoy the privilege of freedom always under the most favorable circumstances? Democracy is a real achievement in a real world, where evil fights unceasingly against the good. If we would win and preserve the good, we must do so under whatever conditions we meet, regardless of the odds against us.

The inescapable necessity of war sets up a tragic conflict in the conscience of every deeply religious person. It is impossible to make war consistent with the absolute values that ennoble human life at its best. We are all of us clear on that score. We can only accept it as a tragic necessity—and in a world where human goodness is a fighting cause we must accept it. It is forced upon us by our failure to achieve the quality of common life that would make war impossible. But it is forced upon us also by our decision to live the life of honor and goodness in a highly dangerous world. We have chosen freedom. And that goal lies not in anything near and easy to achieve, but across fearful abysses and along a road which leads through the valley of the shadow of death. There are times when the irresponsible wanderings of men tempt forth from ambush along the way the most fearsome enemies, enemies who bear a fateful resemblance to the evil that lies latent in all of us. It is only by opposing these enemies that we can end them.

War has chosen us. Let us neither exult in that fact, nor faint before it. Let us rather accept a double responsibility. As we face the tragic necessity of conquering our ruthless enemies, let us resolve by the full truth that is in us never again to leave the field of battle until we have also conquered ourselves. As believing liberal Christians our inescapable task is to keep alive in this America at war the power of the faith that can redeem the victory from hatefulness, and from new, more terrible defeats. It is our humble duty to carry forward unceasingly the works of the spirit which we have so confidently begun.

And above all else, let us build our church, even in this evil time, as the foundation of all that is hopeful, of all that men will need for their spirits in that future which will reveal anew the sacred destiny of mankind.

"Quite a Nice Parade"

A woman said, "It's quite a nice parade."
(Perhaps, to make herself be less afraid.)
She saw them pass between the traffic press:
Too young the boys in tan militia dress;
Too new the ambulances passing by
Now empty yet expecting boys to die;
Light-hearted children following mounted guns—
Guns sired by Hates, now carrying embryo ones;
On sidewalks, tightened lips and smarting eyes
Of those who smiled and said their stiff goodbyes
Two decades past to fathers of these sons.
The little woman must have seen the guns;
She must have felt the terror guns have made,
And yet she murmured, "Quite a nice parade."

HELEN FIELD WATSON.

Correspondence

A Reply to Mr. Yarros

To UNITY:

"New Light on Anti-Semitism?" by Victor S. Yarros, in your May number, presents the basic argument of Baron Rothschild's colonization plan and a not inconsiderable portion of the Zionist movement. It is unquestionably sound to say that the owner of the land determines the character of its use and the mores of those who live upon it. The Quakers, Mennonites, Mormons, and other well-known sects, have in this way created a climate friendly both to themselves and their way of life.

Given the same condition, the Jews would be no exception, as the Zionists have well demonstrated in Palestine. Permitted to colonize, like the Catholics in Maryland, the Quakers in Pennsylvania, the Swedes in Delaware, and the Puritans in Massachusetts, the Jews would present no different problem. If the Jews had been allowed to settle the West, as the Germans in Iowa and the Swedes in Minnesota and the Mormons in Utah, there would be no such problem as now shakes the foundation of our Western civilization.

But, alas, they were not. From the earliest times Jews have been excluded both from the land and other fields of normal, life-giving activities.

We are inclined to overlook the fact that the status of the European Jew has always been and still is a political, economic, and social football of the ruling powers. He has been, and still is, the red herring deluxe of European statesmen and church diplomacy.

In this light is it not a species of wishful thinking to say that a Jew, by going into farming, can help solve the problem of anti-Semitism, created and maintained by the powers-that-be? The individual Jew is confronted with the same anti-Semitism in a community of farmers as in a community of workers, businessmen, and others—otherwise law-abiding and God-fearing heathens. Is the lot of the sharecropper any better or worse than that of the unorganized and submerged "other half" exploited in the factories and sweatshops of the South and, until recently, in the North as well?

No, I do not think you have the answer, Mr. Yarros. I am more inclined to Mr. Wallace's solution, viz.: to wipe out from our land all discriminatory practices and discrimination. We must place ourselves foursquare on the Declaration of Independence, the rock of equality and freedom.

Our democracy, like the proverbial chain, is no stronger than its weakest link. The Jew, the Catholic, the yellow man, the red and the black man, he who comes from the north of Europe and he who comes from the south, from the east and the west, whether he lives in Asia, Africa, South America—they are all men and women, human beings entitled to humane treatment by their fellow humans everywhere.

Since Jews did not create anti-Semitism, they cannot hope to abolish it, but they can live democratically and associate themselves with other like-minded persons, to bring about such condition of living and thinking that race hatred would be as popular as the measles.

Chicago, Illinois. CHARLES P. SCHWARTZ.

A Reader Comments on the June Issue

To UNITY:

I think it would have been more interesting and instructive if, in place of space given to an "Understanding of the Pharisees," you had used the space discussing some problem of our own days. The Pharisees have long since ceased to be a part of our modern life. Also I was disappointed to read of Mr. Holmes' admiration for the peace plan of the Pope. That man, high in the estimation of millions of deluded followers, lives the life of a crowned king, with his armed soldiers, and enjoys all the luxury and show of the royalty, yet assumes to represent the life and interests of Jesus, the Jew. There is a wide sea of difference between the human interests of the historical Jesus, and the aims and achievements of the theological Christ. The only salvation that will bring universal peace and security, will be the elimination of ignorance and poverty, but ignorance is the great evil to be overcome, for it is the father of all the other evils. The world war that we are engaged in today is due to the real ignorance of the ruling classes in the various nations; and because of this lack of wisdom, we rush to the use of all the modern machinery for the harvest of death and destruction.

Lansing, Michigan. E. H. BARRETT.